

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-38 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 have been amended. Claims 3, 7—14, 17, and 20 are cancelled. Claims 23-38 are added. Claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 are the independent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. US-2002-0145702, hereinafter “Kato”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See MPEP Sec. 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2D 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Kato does not teach or suggest all of the limitations set forth in the claims. For example, independent claim 1 recites, among other things, “wherein the plurality of reproduction paths include a first reproduction path forming a first version of one title and a second reproduction path forming a second version of one title, and the first reproduction path is not reproduced during reproduction of the second reproduction path and the second reproduction path is not reproduced during reproduction of the first reproduction path, wherein the first reproduction path and the second reproduction path include a common path portion referring a same clip file.” The Applicant respectfully asserts that Kato does not teach or suggest all of the limitations set forth in amended claim 1 including the above-quoted language.

According to amended claim 1, the plurality of reproduction paths is further defined to include i. a first reproduction path forming a first version of one title and ii. a second reproduction path forming a second version of one title. The first reproduction path is not reproduced during reproduction of the second reproduction path and the second reproduction path is not reproduced during reproduction of the first reproduction path.

Further, the first reproduction path and the second reproduction path include a common path portion referring to a same clip file. The above-mentioned features of claim 1 are not taught, suggested, or otherwise disclosed by Kato or any other cited reference.

On page 3 of the Office Action, Kato is recited in the rejection of claim 1. In particular, paragraphs [0182] and [0212] - [0213] are used to support the rejection. Paragraph [0182] of Kato recites:

“FIG. 7 shows the audio dubbing (post-recording) to the Virtual PlayList. This is an operation of registering the audio post-recording to the Virtual PlayList as a sub-path. This audio post-recording is supported by the application software. An additional audio stream is added as a sub-path to the AV stream of the main path of the Virtual PlayList.” (emphasis added)

The Office Action contends that the above-quoted portion of Kato corresponds to the feature that the plurality of reproduction paths are different versions of one title to be reproduced exclusively. However, the multi-path video data is defined according to the description of the present application at paragraph [0044] of the published application where it states “various versions of a title or portions of a title may be recorded, and therefore, reproduced from the recording data. For example, video data representing different camera angles may be recorded on the recording medium. Or, an adult version, a young adult version, and young child version (i.e., different parental control versions) of a title or portions of a title may be recorded on the recording medium. Each version represents a different reproduction path, and the video data in these instances is referred to as multiple reproduction path video data.” (emphasis added)

Thus, as can be seen, the structure of the main path and the sub-path which is added to the main path as described in the Kato reference is different and patentably distinguished from the multi-path data recited in claim 1 which includes independent alternative paths for each other rather than a dependent path for another main path. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that all of the limitations set forth in amended claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Kato and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 and its dependent claims to be removed.

The Applicant respectfully notes that the other independent claims 5, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 and their corresponding dependent claims also recite language similar to that cited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that all of the pending claims are therefore patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of the pending claims as being anticipated by Kato be removed.

<Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank>

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each pending claim in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: 

Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

TLC/PXL:eab